Comparability of Soviet and US Statistics

- true". The USER collects statistical data not merely for propagand; purposes, but to facilitate its economic planning and to control the execution of its economic plans. While it is scartines to the interest of Soviet factory managers to falsify their statistical reports, it is to the interest of the Soviet central authorities to obtain accurate statistics. Therefore, falsification of reports at lower levels is subject to severe punishment.
- 2. It is true that the UEER is interested in publishing statistical reports of economic performance, to place itself in a favorable light to the outside world. Close examination of published Soviet statistics, however, has shown that deliberate falsification is the exception rather than the rule.
- common with those of other countries, depends on definitions of the quantities being measured. Scartines terms are explicitly defined: at other times definitions depend upon customary usage; at other times terms are not defined and the definition must be derived from an examination of the data being measured. For these reasons the statistics of the USSE and the USSE and the upon customary usage; at other times terms are not defined and the definition must be derived from an examination of the data being measured. For these reasons the statistics of the USSE and the upon not always comparable. Careful economic analysis therefore requires that before comparison is made of the performance of the

that the data be examined for comparability. Where the data are not comparable, it is standard practice amongst careful enalysts to identify the differences in manner of measurement and convert the data to a comparable basis.

4. In the following illustrations drawn from Soviet production of machine tools, footwear, and woolen cloth, comparability depends in large part upon the definition of the items being measured. If the US production of machine tools be taken from the reports of the members of the National Machine Tool Builders Association, the figure will exclude the production of nonmembers, who are estimated to produce about 15 to 25 per cent of the output of the industry. CIA, therefore, bases its estimate: of US production on a 15 per cent increase over MATTA figures. On the other hand the production (shipments) reported by the Censu: Bureau, include a large number of small tools such as beach-typ: grinders, excluded from the MWBTA and USER statistics. CIA estimates that in 1957 Census Bureau estimates included over 34,000 such bench grinders, averaging about \$60 a unit, together with some 10,000 other units not reported as machine tools in Soviet statistics. The URE compares its machine tool production with US census figures, which places the USSR in second place. Comparison with which figures places the USSR in first place. CIA, in collecting and making available to US policy makers,

Production of Metaleutting Machine Tools (in units)

	LB.		TBSR AND
ners.	A*	B. of C. **	
1950	41,500	328,580 (minimus)	70,597
1951	70,800	-	71,162
1952	96,800	u t	74,550
1953	91,500	de	91,759
195k	58 , 500	b.r	102, 362
1955	5 0, 500	Bia .	117,007
1956	63,900	/ **	121, 300
19 57	53,700	94,400 (minimum)	130,000
1958	27,000***	nag.	138,000
1959***			145,000
1965****			190,000 - 200,000

^{*} National Machine Tool Builders Association

^{**} Bureau of the Census, Facts for Industry series M35W-07 peophlets on Machine Tools

^{***} Preliminary report is October 1953

^{****} Plan

information on the two industries, seeks to present comparable data, rather than to make a propaganda case for either country.

- 5. During the period 1952 through 1958, MMSTA reported production of \$42,000 units. Estimating a 15% additional output for other producers gives the US an output of 508,000 units, compared to 775,000 for the USSR. In 1952, Soviet production fell below the US on a unit for unit basis, in output, technology, and capacity. In 1958 the USSR output of machine tools technically equivalent to the US models in current production equalled or even exceeded the entire US output.
- 6. Admittedly these Figures measure production and not capacity. Capacity to manufacture machine tools is not reported by the official statistics of either the USSR or the US. Capacity is difficult to estimate and would have little meaning unless it took into account the convertibility of other capital equipment to machine tool manufacture.
- 7. As the attached Annex shows, comparability of statistical reporting is also a problem in the case of light manufacturing products such as footwear and wool textiles. The USSR definition of shoes includes not only all leather shoes but shoes whose uppers are made of combination leather and textiles. It probably includes athletic shoes and sneakers, but is believed to exclude rubber and felt footwear. The more limited US definition includes leather, play, and athletic shoes, but excludes tennis shoes, sneakers, slippers, and rubber footwear. The Soviet definition is broad enough to include a variety of leathers and leather substitutes not generally acceptable.

to US purchasers. Soviet production of 315 million pairs
Approved For Release 2001/07/28: CIA-RDP62S00231A000100110121-8

in 1957, nevertheless fell well below the 529 million pairs produced in the US. Although Soviet production grew at 5.8 per cent per year from 1952 to 1958, more than twice the 1.9 per cent increase of the UE output in the same period, it must be noted that Sowiet production represents a quantity which the State is willing to allocate to its population whereas the lower US growth rate reflects the efforts of UE memufacturers to meet the demands of the UE population, whose meeds in the part have been so adequately and that little repressed densid can be said to exist in the US. Moreover, the Soviet effort to "coton up with the West" represents an effort to match US production in quantity at the expense of probable for ther sacrifices in quality and with no significant improvement in the present unattractive styles or limited choice of models. Mere numbers produced are therefore not a good comparison of the shoe production of the two countries. Meither would selling price of the shoes produced, since price is artificially established in the USSR. To achieve a measure of true compersbility it would be necessary to value the Soviet output in US terms.

C. A similar situation exists in the production of wool sloth. The width of Soviet sloth is not officially reported but is believed to average only 42 inches as compared with the US practice of reporting wool cloth on a 14 inch minimum width basis. Moreover, Soviet practice defines as wool for statistical purposes, material with less than 50 per cent wool content. It is believed that nost wool cloth contains less than 100 per cent wool content and that the

wood substitutes used generally consist of materials such as critical or rayon that lower the quality of the finished product. In contrast since 1951, US statistics include only fabric containing at least 51 per cent or more of wood. In the US the addition of wood-like synthetic fibers to improve the quality of the final product is spreading rapidly. Essenthiless, climatic differences and differences in indoor heating practices and changes in US consumer preferences make it understandable that the demand for wood textilesin the USSR may exceed that of the US and may well result in the USSR overtaking the US in wood fabric production. Again, as in the case of the production of footwear, mere numbers, without reference to quality, are not an adequate measure of the respective outputs of the two countries.

Comparability of Soviet and US Data on Footwear.

Production of Footwear

(milliana of pairs)

1950 1951	1954 19	55 1956	1957	1958	1965
UBBR 203 240	258 2	74 : 290 :	315	356	, 51. 5
us 465 n.a.	473 5	17 521.	529	n.a.	n.a.

Average Annual Rates of Growth

			1952-58	4	1959-65
user	4		5.8		5.5
		Part of the second			÷
1951-57			1.9*		n.c.

Soviet definition -- USER production comprises shoes of all leather, combination leather uppers, and textile uppers; probably includes athletic shoes and "sneakers" but excludes rubber and felt footwear.

US definition -- US production comprises leather including play shoes and athletic shoes but excludes termis shoes and sneekers; excludes slippers and rubber footsser.

comments: Comparison of Soviet footwear statistics with US statistics requires careful evaluation of the differences in definition as given above. The USSR intends to "catch up with the West" is footwear in numbers only; in order to reach this goal further sacrifices in quality are planned.

Materials utilised in the Soviet industry, in addition to quality leather, include pigskin, goat skin, and various non-leather substitutes. Artificial leather is to be used extensively in achievement of 1965 goal. Of total leather footwear (produced by the Ministry) in

remainder had uppers of textile and combination materials. Quality often does not warrant shoe repair. Styles are unattractive, choice limited, and workmanship crude.

Comparability of Soviet and U.S. Data on Wool Cloth

Production of Wool Cloth

(millions of linear meters)

<u>1950</u> 1951	1954	1955	<u> 1956</u> <u>1957</u> <u>1958</u> <u>1</u>	965
USSR 155 176	243	251	268 282 303	500
us., 423 n.a.	262	29 3	300 267 n.a. n.	. a.

Average Annual Rates of Growth

	1952-58	1959-65
USSR	8.1	7.6

US Production declined

n.a.

Soviet definition -- Wool cloth is reported in linear meters in the USSR.

The width is not officially given; however, a reliable economist studying.

the USSR reports the average width to be 42 inches.

No explicit information is available regarding quality of the various types of wool included in Soviet reported totals. Industry data for 1955 show that very small percentages (6% and less) of wool cloth for clothing is 100% wool. It is probable that cloth with only small percentages of wool are counted as wool cloth and that the bulk of output of wool cloth has high rate of blend. Observation of clothing available for purchase in USSR supports this estimate.

High quality wool substitutes are not available for blending, therefore the blending materials available, cotton and rayon, lowers the

overall quality of the product.

US definition -- US statistics comprise fabrics containing 51% or more of wool. Years 1950 and earlier included all fabric containing 25% or more wool. US wool cloth is reported on the basis of 54 inch width (minimum). Therefore, a linear meter of wool cloth in the US is at least 12 inches wider than in the USER.

Comments: Because of differences in width in data reported and in the quality of wool fabries, Soviet and US data can not be considered comparable. In addition, consumer preference for the high quality wool substitutes (Orlan, Diaron, etc.) has resulted in reduced output of wool cloth in the US. Mines the USER has no comparable wool substitutes the production of wool cloth probably will continue to indresse. In 1956 in the US, production of fabries of wool-like synthetic fiber was about equal to production of wool cloth, which reflects increasing consumer preference for synthetics. In addition, Soviet comparisons with US production also overlook the fact that the US imports simple quantities of wool cloth by the USE.